

ber of births has declined to its lowest point since World War II, and has been on a steady decline since 1958. I would conclude that the country has passed over the financial crisis that existed in the fifties and which was aggravated by the 4-year period of World War II when little school facilities were constructed.

The poverty problems that exist today are capable of being remedied on the State level by State equalization laws and at the local level by local equalization laws. Though there are presently some inadequate State and local equalization laws, the President's message has no recommendations to make for their improvement. Indeed the failure to even mention these laws leads one to wonder whether the President's advisers are aware of their existence. The message also ignores the fact that school districts depend primarily on local property taxes—taxes on wealth, not incomes. To be sure these taxes like all taxes are burdensome but these taxes are open and visible, where other taxes are hidden from view. And it is remarkable to review the percentage of school bond issues proposed that the people have authorized by their votes in the past decade.

There is no assurance that the money to be appropriated under the President's bill will even begin to solve the problems at hand, indeed, there is much greater probability that this money will go elsewhere than where there is genuine need. This is the thrust of the statement made on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] who is the ranking minority member of the House Education and Labor Committee.

The bill that I am introducing today is one which I feel will solve some of the remaining problems in the field of school financing. The school districts will continue to need revenues but they can obtain them if the Federal Government will desist from taxing some of the personal income which is spent locally for education.

The bill I propose would allow to each Federal income-tax payer an alternative. The first alternative would be against his Federal personal income tax, up to \$100, for State and local taxes paid for educational purposes, of the types specified in the deduction section of the Internal Revenue Code.

A renter of property could claim that proportion of the real estate tax paid by the landlord which might be allowable to him as an individual renter as part of his tax credit.

The second alternative is a credit against Federal personal income tax for each allowable dependent who attends school, equal to \$50 per student but limited to \$200.

The bill also allows a credit against Federal personal income tax; for example, to those individuals bearing the cost of college education, on a sliding scale up to \$325 per college student.

The proposals in this bill have been in the germination stage for many years. On February 4, 1965, Prof. Roger A. Freeman of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, in his testimony before the House

Education and Labor Committee, Subcommittee on Education, which was holding hearings on the President's proposed educational acts, stated in support of a tax credit for real property taxes paid:

The tax credit approach offers several decisive advantages over the grant-in-aid approach. It does not threaten to impose Federal controls because it involves no contact between Federal, State, and local school authorities. The most attractive feature of the tax credit approach, however, is that it provides a method by which the Federal Government can help the public schools financially without incurring the charge that it unfairly discriminates between the children attending public and private schools. The church-state issue which has been a main obstacle to Federal action for many years would not be involved in the tax credit approach. No Federal funds would be allocated to either public or private schools and all taxpayers would be treated alike.

Along with the educational advantages, my purpose in introducing this bill is overall basic tax reform. I am convinced that it is in error for the Federal Government to tax income which is being spent to achieve social purposes for which the Federal Government otherwise might be spending money itself. This bill, the Education Tax Adjustment Act of 1965, would also reinforce the foundation of a national tax structure that has become topheavy. It would return a measure of taxing power to the local governing bodies which traditionally pay for and control education in this country. In this field, at least, some measure of balance would be regained.

It seems obvious to me that if we pass this bill we will have resolved the two otherwise insurmountable barriers to Federal aid to education: fear of Federal control and, second, the church-state issue.

FATHER'S WEEKEND AT WHEATON COLLEGE, NORTON, MASS.

(Mr. SCHNEEBELI (at the request of Mr. MORRIS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, while attending a delightful "Father's Weekend" at Wheaton College, Norton, Mass., it was my good fortune to listen to a cheering and refreshing appraisal of our present college generation by the president, Dr. William C. H. Prentice. Particularly at this time, when our colleges apparently are confronted with many difficult problems including social unrest, sordid behavior and unruly conduct, it is reassuring to be told by someone in authority and immediate contact with the students that our current generation has "a basic moral standard and a basic understanding of what is worthy in life that is not only equal to those that we hold, or held at their age; it is superior." It is indeed a comfort to have this critical evaluation, and after spending the weekend at the college and participating in some of the student activities I wholeheartedly concur in this positive conclusion.

Dr. Prentice observes:

It is surely one of the purposes of colleges like Wheaton to accentuate the positive and to build on the lively interest, the moral strength, and the emotional resilience of the young.

Today, when there is so much emphasis on the sordid, it is inspiring to hear someone "accentuate the positive." Dr. Prentice's talk follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. PRENTICE, WHEATON COLLEGE, NORTON, MASS.

One of the burdens of growing up is the terrifying propensity of adults to tell us that we are too young to do half the things we want to do and too old to do the other half. I sometimes think that the emotional intensity with which parents make such statements and the emotional intensity with which they are received are at their very highest during college years. It is hard to remember clearly the childish things we did when we were in college (and often inconvenient to recall them.), and it is impossible to believe that the little girl who was a high school freshman so recently is really now a grown woman. I should think that the current generation of students would find public attitudes toward them almost as frustrating as they find the individual attitudes of their own parents. It has been no more than a couple of years since the articles in publications like the New York Times Sunday Magazine were complaining of the apathy of American college students. Today the same journals (and some of the same writers) are complaining of the students' activism. I suppose one of the basic lessons we all learn in the years between 15 and 25 is that you really cannot win. The old people are going to criticize you whatever you do.

I am frequently asked to comment on the current generation of college students. Usually the question takes a slightly subtler form of "You do think the young people are going to the dogs, don't you?" Sometimes, however, the question is more tentative and not without pathos. The questioner seems to be begging for reassurance that our daughters are not, after all, totally deserting the standards of their parents. One of the most touching questions came from a student herself who asked me whether I am discouraged about her generation. She went on to say that her parents seem to despair of the taste and the moral standards of her friends and contemporaries and that they sometimes come close to persuading her that they are right and that today's young people are about to throw away the heritage of ages and build their own society on false and insubstantial foundations. I suppose it is as evident to you as it is to me that her mere question, her mere recognition of the difference between high standards and low, in some sense assures her own salvation and guarantees that she will not, as her parents fear, be seduced by what is unworthy.

But what about the generation as a whole? Is it falling prey to evil forces, to enticements of the flesh, to comfort, to self-concern, to hostility, to cynicism? Surely it sometimes seems so. Beauty and sentiment seem to have fled from the popular arts, to be replaced by a cult of the ugly: dissonance and yeh-yeh-yeh. Wholesome pleasures seem to have been replaced by drinking and smoking and even narcotics. Religion seems to be a joke or a bore. Politics seems to create interest only through extremist movements. Sexual relations appear to be unrestrained by moral or social standards. Respect for established authority or for one's elders is hard to find among certain groups. Violence and vandalism seem to be taken for granted among at least some young people. There is no doubt that there is some justice in parental concerns.

But I should like to look with you at another side. The future of our world, if it has a future, lies with people who are basically unselfish, people who think of themselves infrequently and who when confronted with a clear choice between self and others, often make the choice in favor of the others. People who hand out rewards and punishments in even-handed ways, treating individuals equally, not with less respect or smaller rewards because of their birth or breeding or skin color. People who have sympathy, in the strict sense of that word, with other people and attempt to participate in others' feelings and thoughts. People who, at their best, are genuinely loving and feel a oneness with other human beings that most of us feel only with respect to members of our immediate families. People who are honest, not attempting to achieve their own ends by misleading others. People who are idealistic, setting standards and goals for themselves and for the world which may transcend realistic achievement but which can nevertheless fix the direction of a life. People who thrive on effort and hard work and sacrifice. The world has always moved ahead only because of the existence of such people. Are they dying out in the present generation? Certainly not. Certainly not.

Students at Wheaton, as in many other colleges, live under an honor system. They bind themselves to obey certain regulations and to see that those regulations are obeyed by others. It works remarkably well. I wonder how many of us can imagine such a system in the city halls or State houses of our respective homes.

These students show increasing concern for the state of society and the world in general, as indeed the current fund drive and other campus activities of the year show. They work long and hard at their academic work, and they add to their 45- or 50-hour-weeks charitable enterprises, pocket money jobs, and political and social interests.

They support one another. One of the most impressive aspects of college life is the degree to which young people in trouble can rely on their fellow students. Half the people who come into a dean's office are not there on their own behalf but are there to try to find a solution for the problems of a roommate or a friend. When a student is dismissed from college for violation of rules or for academic failure, it is routine for other students to volunteer to make personal sacrifices in order to give the dismissed student another chance.

They are honest. There is probably less hypocrisy in a group of college students than almost anywhere else. I sometimes think that what shocks their elders most is exactly their cheerful forthrightness in facing their own shortcomings and talking about them.

They are charitable. If the question of racial integration were left to the college students of this country, the problems would have long since disappeared. At their best they are sacrificial and brave. The young people who have entered Mississippi and Alabama to do the hard work of registering Negro voters and aiding in the education of the young have risked and occasionally lost their lives.

I have no hesitation in saying that today's college students have a basic moral standard and a basic understanding of what is worthy in life that is not only equal to those that we hold, or held at their age; it is superior.

Your daughters will tell you, if they have not already done so, that there are problems in their generation, as in every generation. They are not saints. Some have greater strength of character than others, and the temptations to human frailty placed before the young people of today are surely no less than they ever were. But by and large no one who spends day in and day out with Wheaton students can have any doubt that they are growing up to be bulwarks of

a moral society, to be mothers and voters and intellectual leaders of whom any society can be proud. But I am concerned with the constant criticism that they sometimes feel exposed to: criticism in the press and criticism at home. I contemplate with sadness the likelihood that when the schools and colleges turn these delightful young people out into the world, that world will gradually force them to become less honest, more hypocritical, less courageous, more selfish, less tolerant, more materialistic, and in general, smaller, narrower, less moral people. If you wish to live in a society where as many as possible of your neighbors come somewhere near to loving you as they love themselves, where as many as possible of your neighbors are genuinely concerned about the world and its future and are willing to make sacrifices for their own ideals, live for awhile, as you are living this weekend, in a college dormitory. But remember that there is no better way to destroy the genuine moral vision of our young people than to exaggerate the moral importance of their foibles or to let them believe that we consider their dress and their dating habits and their views about the Beatles of greater cosmic importance than dishonesty in government and business, poverty and despair in city tenements; police brutality in Selma, or the wanton destruction of lives in the Congo and in Vietnam.

It is surely one of the purposes of colleges like Wheaton to accentuate the positive and to build on the lively interest, the moral strength, and the emotional resilience of the young. I hope we can always have the joyful support of parents in this enterprise.

And if your daughters are full of health and promise, what about the college? What is the current state of Wheaton? It too comes in for its share of criticism some of it deserved, some not, some serious, some petty, most of it (like the criticism you direct at your daughters) constructive in purpose and friendly in tone. Like the girls, we have some of the pains and problems of growth and of establishing for ourselves a new and more significant role in society. Like the girls, we have chosen, I believe, a basically sound set of goals and need only to learn how to modify and adjust our approaches to those goals.

We have recently strengthened our faculty by additions to the departments of economics, government, sociology, and history. We have also enlarged the staff of classics, Spanish, German, Russian, and French. We will add another professor in art and one in philosophy next year. We have also substantially increased faculty salaries for another year and have undertaken to provide new quarters for the nursery school and for the department of psychology, the former in a new building and the latter by remodeling of the old gymnasium which will be freed when our impressive Clark Recreation Center is opened in a few weeks.

The curriculum continues under active and continuous review, as do calendars, grading procedures, and other aspects of our major task.

We shall have to undertake a major campaign for capital needs sometime in the next couple of years in order to provide badly needed scholarship funds, the long overdue science building (already designed and awaiting the necessary money) and various renovations and restorations of existing facilities, including an organ for this building which you will see in scale model in Watson Hall.

But we are on our way. We are happy about our general goals and achievements, and we intend to build for the future on the traditional Wheaton description of an excellent, small, residential, private, liberal arts college for women. Those adjectives are all

important to our plans and, we think, to the continued health of the college.

Let me close by saying that whatever satisfaction you may find in Wheaton this weekend should in part be credited to generations of our conscientious forebears, but most of what Wheaton is today and can become must be credited to your daughters. Don't ever underestimate their generation.

SLOVAK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the Members' attention to the 26th anniversary of Slovak Independence Day.

Unfortunately, high-ranking officials in our Government, especially in the pre-World War II period and during the diplomatic negotiations with the Soviets in the latter days of the war, failed to understand the aspirations of the Slovak people for independence.

Consequently, the brave Slovak people, along with other nations behind the Iron Curtain, are now suffering under the dread oppression of communism. I certainly hope and pray that the Slovak people's courageous spirit and love of freedom will be maintained until the day when they regain their national independence. Surely they will be freed from Communist persecution and achieve their rightful place in the community of free nations.

I know that the religious heritage of Roman Catholicism, which the great majority of Slovaks hold dear, is a constant source of inner strength to them in resisting Communist philosophy.

NEW BILL WILL BAN FOREIGN SHIPS TRADING WITH CUBA AND NORTH VIETNAM FROM VISITING U.S. PORTS

(Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to prohibit transportation in commercial articles to or from the United States aboard vessels of any foreign country which allows its merchant marine to be used in trade with Communist Cuba or North Vietnam.

The United States has long had an embargo on trade with both Cuba and North Vietnam.

In addition in 1962 President Kennedy called for a voluntary boycott of Castro's Cuba by all freedom-loving nations. To some small degree this latter boycott has succeeded, but the United States has been reluctant to clamp down on the vessels of foreign nations that refused to comply with the boycott.

Now it is time to stop shipment of American cargoes in foreign vessels that are trading with Cuba and North Vietnam. In the last half of 1964 over 200 ships flying flags of our allies or of the free world transported Communist goods

to North Vietnam and these same ships are being permitted to compete with our American-flag vessels in visiting and doing business in our own U.S. ports.

As introduced, by bill would ban these free world vessels from using U.S. ports if they engage in shipping to or from Communist Cuban or Vietcong ports.

I am hopeful that immediate hearings will be held on my bill by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The time has long since passed when the United States should firm up its policy on trading with the enemy and in this connection we should exert pressure on other free world countries to stop strengthening the Communists in Cuba and Vietnam.

The number of my bill is H.R. 6301.

JAY G. HAYDEN

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of the retirement of Jay G. Hayden, who for nearly 50 years has been a political writer in Washington for the Detroit News.

Today, under leave to extend my remarks, I include his last dispatch entitled "Signing Off." I think all of us who have known Jay and appreciated his outstanding services will be interested in his "last dispatch" which appeared in the Detroit News on February 26, 1965:

HAYDEN IN WASHINGTON: SIGNING OFF

(By Jay G. Hayden)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—In this, my last dispatch, to the Detroit News after more than 49 years as a Washington correspondent it seems fitting to recall a few of the changes, particularly as effecting news reporting, over this long period.

Taking off from Detroit on Christmas Day, 1915, I boarded the Pennsylvania Railroad's Capitol Limited at 11 a.m. and arrived in Washington after breakfast the following morning.

Moving my family later, our model T Ford was loaded in a freight car along with the furniture and was 5 weeks in transit. The automobile, drained for fear of fire, was pushed out on the freight platform on arrival and treated to one quart of free gasoline to enable me to drive it away. I seem to recall that the price of gasoline at that time was about 10 cents a gallon.

There were advantages and disadvantages for newspaper reporters in those days. Helpful was the total absence of radio and television, leaving printed words all alone in the field of public information. Telephones were widely used locally, but had barely begun to develop over long distances. News transmission within the United States and overseas was almost exclusively by hand operated telegraph or by mail.

COMPETING WIRES

There was the advantage, however, that competition between two telegraph companies, Western Union and Postal, for newspaper trade was terrific. Their lines were numerous manned in the press galleries of Congress, at the White House, and wherever else news was breaking.

The most important single difference between 1916 and the present is the phenomenal growth of Federal Government, not only in personnel, physical establishment, and ex-

penditure, but in activities affecting the lives of all American people.

The whole cost of the Federal Government for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1916, was \$734,156,202. There was great commotion when for fiscal 1917 President Woodrow Wilson asked for and was granted appropriations slightly exceeding \$1 billion. Expenditures for fiscal 1917 actually leaped to \$1,977,681,751 due to the U.S. declaration of war against Germany, April 7, 1917. The peak annual expenditure during the World War I period, for fiscal 1919, however, was only \$18,514,879,955.

The latter figure has been exceeded in every year beginning with 1943 and climaxed by \$97,670,862,844 for fiscal 1964 under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

By all present signs Federal cost escalation is still going on, and so long as deficits continue to grow it is just as certain that the burden must fall back one day on the shoulders of American taxpayers.

EASIER TO SEE

News reporting was more fun in the earlier days due to much closer contacts with ruling officials. If memory serves, no pass was required for reporter admission to the White House until World War II, but that impediment has continued since, in war or peace.

For President Wilson's 8 years the Congressional Directory lists only three White House assistants—Joseph P. Tumulty, secretary, Thomas Brahany, chief clerk, and Rudolph Forester, executive clerk—and that's actually all there were except women typists.

The comparable roll of White House aids to President Johnson published in January 1964, numbered 27 and certainly at salaries so high that they would have caused even President Wilson's Cabinet members to blush.

In Congress there is only one man left from the 1915-16 session and curiously his surname is the same as this writer. He is CARL HAYDEN, 87-year-old Senator from Arizona, President pro tempore of the Senate, and chairman of its Committee on Appropriations.

Senator HAYDEN was first elected to the House in 1912, coincident with admission of his State to the Union, and continued to serve in that body until 1927 when he advanced to the Senate where he has remained ever since.

VOTING RIGHTS AND SELMA, ALA.

(Mr. LANGEN (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Congress was in the midst of much controversy over a proposed civil rights bill. After much debate during the long, hot summer, a bill finally emerged, thanks to the Members of both political parties who realized that discrimination had no place in the scope of full American life.

In that bill was a section on voting rights. I am sure the people of the Nation returned to their chores with the feeling that at long last every American would have an equal opportunity to register and vote, regardless of his race, color, or creed. Perhaps that is why the recent events in Selma, Ala., have come as a shock to the Nation, including the people of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, if the present law is so weak that it deprives any of our citizens of their treasured American right to vote,

or if the law has loopholes that prevent the Federal Government from enforcing voting rights, then the law must be changed. And it must be changed promptly. When a minority has waited so long for such a privilege, guaranteed to all Americans, he must not be forced to wait any longer. But this time, let us make sure we are giving him that right so that there is no further question on the subject and so that there is no further duress on either side.

And further, Mr. Speaker, before any of us condemn the community of Selma, we must realize that there, too, Americans live and work. All are not bitter racists, all are not club-swinging and tear-gas throwing police or troopers.

One thing seems clear. If Federal laws have been broken in Selma, Ala., no matter which side or person broke them, prompt action should be taken by the Federal Government. If no Federal laws have been violated, then we cannot demand Federal force simply because it appears to be humane. Violence cannot be condoned by any of us, but it cannot be suppressed without due cause, or by any agency other than one so authorized.

Let the Congress then proceed with diligence and determination to consider in proper course the legislation that has been recommended to us by the President.

REPEAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATIONS

(Mr. BROCK (at the request of Mr. MORTON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, Congress voted temporary increases in excise tax rates to help cover the cost of our country's participation in the Korean war. The increases were extended in 1954 and annually since then. Taxes on general telephone service and transportation, which had been imposed in 1941, were included in the annual extensions starting in 1959. The excise tax extensions have been one of many measures designed to finance the uncontrolled spending appetite of the big central government.

I firmly believe the selective excise tax is discriminatory and should be scrapped. The Congress has a moral obligation to the people to eliminate these temporary taxes which were imposed for a special purpose so long ago. I know that previous efforts to accomplish this reform in Congress have failed. But something must be done to alleviate the burden of these unfair taxes that hit hardest at the low income citizen who must pay the same tax rates as those with a greater ability to pay. One of the most unjust excise taxes is the 10 percent levy on communications.

Altogether, the Federal Government expects to take in about \$14.7 billion from excise taxes this fiscal year. Of this amount, telephone and telegraph users will pay one billion dollars to the Federal Government for the privilege of

using communication services. In my State of Tennessee, consumers will pay \$14½ million in communications excise tax this year. Of course, the telephone and telegraph companies pay Federal taxes too, and since some of this by necessity must be passed on to the user, the American people are suffering double taxation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would repeal the excise tax on communications, and I urge my colleagues to rally their support to this important measure.

FEDERAL OFFENSE TO ASSASSINATE THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

(Mr. WILLIS (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would make it a Federal offense to assassinate the President or Vice President of the United States, or the next person in line of succession to the Presidency.

I would like to state for the record that, when the idea of such a law was first proposed immediately after the assassination of President Kennedy, I had some reservations about such a statute because it occurred to me that a basic constitutional issue was involved: namely, that of Federal impingement upon the exercise of police powers which are constitutionally reserved to the States.

After considerable thought and weighing of all the factors involved, I reached the conclusion that the killing of the President or Vice President of the United States, or the next person in line of succession—our highest Federal officers—is certainly a matter of valid and deep concern to the Congress and the people of the Nation as a whole and a matter in which the Federal Government may properly exercise even an exclusive jurisdiction.

This is not new ground. As most of you know, the Congress, operating on a similar principle, has already exercised its powers in this area in section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, which makes it a Federal offense to kill other lesser Federal officers, such as Federal judges, FBI or narcotics agents, and postal inspectors.

In addition, when we are dealing with situations which, in some instances, could have national as well as international ramifications—as I will shortly point out—it seems to me that there is a very real necessity for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, which I have the honor to chair, has looked into this problem very carefully.* In its annual report for the year 1963, with my endorsement, it recommended enactment of legislation to make the killing of the President or Vice President a Federal offense. The committee has been pleased to note that the Warren Commission, in its report of September 24, 1964, came to the same conclusion as the committee had on this matter.

Since the initial recommendation in its 1963 report, the committee, continuing its study of the matter, has reviewed the various bills introduced in the Congress which would implement its recommendation. On March 8, a bill which encompassed its recommendation was submitted by the Attorney General. This bill would make it a crime, not only to kill, or attempt or conspire to kill, the President or Vice President or the next person in line of succession, but would also make it a crime to assault, or to kidnap, or attempt or conspire to kidnap, them. It is my view, based on the committee study I have referred to, that this bill would be most effective in meeting the problem before us. It is for this reason that the bill I introduce today is an identical bill, filed in support of the administration's proposal.

Careful analysis of all factors involved in this issue make it clear, I now believe, that there are a number of reasons why existing State laws may, in many cases, be inadequate vehicles for the prosecution of Presidential or Vice-Presidential assassins.

These reasons have been pinpointed in the assassination of President Kennedy and in certain other recent developments.

The Warren Commission has found that Lee Harvey Oswald shot President Kennedy. It has also found that one of the factors that may have influenced him to kill the President was "His avowed commitment to Marxism and communism."

Oswald's Communist ties and commitments are now well known and documented. He had resided in the Soviet Union for 2 years, where he attempted to renounce his U.S. citizenship and expressed his hate for the United States and his desire for its capitalist government to be overthrown. Shortly before he assassinated our late President, he made a trip to Mexico City where he contacted both the Soviet and Cuban embassies.

It is known that he was in contact with the New York headquarters of the Moscow-controlled Communist Party and also of the Socialist Workers Party, the Trotskyist Communist organization in this country. Both of these organizations have international ties. Oswald was also an activist in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, an organization having ties with the Communist government of Cuba.

A few weeks ago the New York Times published an account which stated that, within the last year, 50 local Philippine officials had been assassinated by the Hukbalahaps, the military arm of the Philippine Communist Party. In South Vietnam, too, local governmental officials have been assassinated in considerable number by Communist agents and forces during the past few years.

The possibility of international ramifications in any assassination of a President or Vice President of the United States is obvious in the context of world conditions today. The Warren Commission took note of this and probed deeply into it. President Johnson also took note of it even before his appointment of the Warren Commission, when he ordered a full-scale investigation of

President Kennedy's assassination by the Department of Justice. His order, of course, brought the total facilities of the FBI into the investigation.

We are faced with the fact that today there is a strong possibility that here, as in other countries, individual Marxists or Marxist organizations may be involved in assassination plots. This being so, tracking down the assassin or assassins and developing all the facts about the conspiracy—should an assassination be the result of such—involves authority, funds, and facilities which simply do not exist in any one of our 50 States. The assassin or his associates, for example, may have to be trailed to foreign countries—to Europe, Latin America, or some other part of the world.

No State had the facilities to make the national and international type investigation that was required for development of the facts in the Oswald case. It was necessary for the President of the United States to utilize in full the research and investigative resources of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Secret Service, the State Department, Central Intelligence Agency, and other governmental groups.

All these facts argue for enactment of Federal legislation in this area.

It is my hope the Congress will act in the near future to meet adequately the problem we now face. In the belief that it may help the debate which will take place, I call the attention of the House to the recommendation on this subject made by the Committee on Un-American Activities, in its 1963 annual report. The text of the recommendation follows:

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

The rules of the House and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, in establishing the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have directed the committee to make investigations of subversive propaganda activities in the United States, whether of a domestic or foreign origin, that attack the principle of the form of government guaranteed by our Constitution and to investigate all other questions in relation thereto that would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation. A duty was further imposed to make a report to the House of the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Pursuant to this mandate, the committee makes the following recommendations:

I. ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

It is recommended that legislation be adopted to make punishable as a Federal offense the unlawful killing of the President or Vice President of the United States.

Title 18, United States Code, sections 1111, 1112, and 1113, respectively, make murder, manslaughter, the attempt to commit murder or manslaughter, Federal crimes only when committed within "the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States." This special jurisdiction is defined in section 7 of title 18, United States Code, and generally includes the waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States (high seas and navigable waters) and lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under its exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction.

Murder or manslaughter of the President or Vice President would also be punishable under Federal law if committed while aboard an aircraft in flight in interstate or foreign commerce (49 U.S.C. sec. 1472(k)).